



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The Future of the Ottoman Empire

By HENRY W. JESSUP, M.A., J.D.
New York

“**M**ENE, MENE, TEKEL, UPHARSIN. MENE: God hath numbered thy kingdom and finished it. TEKEL: Thou art weighed in the balances and found wanting. PERES: Thy kingdom is divided.” These words uttered to the reckless Belshazzar are equally applicable to the Sultan of Turkey. “The writing is on the wall.” By successive breaches of trust, by cruelties beyond recording, by a congenital incapacity to appreciate the restraints of civilization, by the very nature of his religion, and, I regret to add, by the very record of his experience in overreaching the great powers after each relapse into savagery, it is no longer a question what shall be done to protect the Turkish empire or to safeguard its integrity, but what shall be done to assure security of life “and an absolutely unmolested opportunity of autonomous development to the oppressed nationalities heretofore under Turkish rule.” And this question relates itself to four of such nationalities: the Armenians, the Greeks, the Syrians and the Arabs. The separation of the last two is intentional.

AMERICA’S RELATION TO THE TURKISH PROBLEM

First, however, what is the relationship of the United States to this problem? It would be idle to speak of the interest of the American people in the sufferings of those upon whom the combined savagery of Turk and Teuton has been unleashed since 1914. Torturings beyond the ingenuity of the inquisition; deportation of entire communities into the deserts; indiscriminate slaughter and robbery; rapings and ravishings; systematic starvation of whole villages by blockade;—all these, thus too mildly summarized, aroused and shocked the conscience of America and elicited a degree of benevolent helpfulness never before paralleled. Hence I may safely assert as my premise that the American people demand of the government of the United States that never again shall it take, in respect to such conditions and such sufferings, the attitude of indifference and trustfulness which the records of our

state department show that it took on the occasion of the last massacres, to go back no further than 1909. I refer to the massacres under "Abdul the Damned" which preceded the so-called "Constitution of July, 1908," which Mr. Leishman, and many others, thought was a real revolution of reform calculated to bring about an era, according to our easy-going minister, "of universal good-will and fraternity among all the races and creeds of the empire." His reports are recorded in a book entitled, *Foreign Relations of the United States*, which is readily accessible. In this same book is recorded the attempt of Congressman Bennett to secure some intervention on the part of the United States to put a stop to the massacres of the Armenians which were again arousing the attention of the civilized world. A petition had been presented to the President, and the Department of State made the following answer:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
WASHINGTON, JUNE 28, 1909.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge your letter of the 18th, enclosing a petition from the representatives of the Armenian Evangelical Alliance, addressed to the President, urging the influence of the United States for the amelioration of the condition of the Armenians.

The petition has been read with attention and interest. This question has from time to time had the earnest consideration of this government for many years, and the recent terrible events in Asia Minor have served to further manifest the deep sympathy of the American people and the abhorrence of the President over the atrocities perpetrated. While the government of the United States, not being a signatory to the Berlin Treaty engagement, deems itself—as the petitioners seem not unaware—precluded from any consideration on its part of a question of intervention in the present circumstances, or of sharing in those treaty responsibilities, the sentiments of this government and its earnest desire that the Armenians shall possess absolute security of life and property are common knowledge to the concert of great powers who by the treaty compact aimed to accomplish that result.

Every thinking American deplores the antagonism, differences, and opposing ambitions which have arrayed the racial and religious elements of the Turkish population against each other. The sufferings of the innocent victims in the late outrages have deeply touched American sympathies. Neither in these events nor in times past has this government looked on unmoved. It has always wished that it had the power to prevent such sufferings, but it is convinced that, in the obvious impossibility of intervention, it is powerless. The broader tendencies developing in the Near East and the moral suasion of the Christian treaty powers must be trusted finally to prevail to reconcile the opposing factions.

It is no longer a question of dealing with a government implicated in the Armenian massacres. It is earnestly believed that the best course now for the betterment of the unfortunate people concerned is to exhibit a degree of confidence in the newly established constitutional government, whose Sultan has solemnly proclaimed to Parliament his horror over the awful slaughter among his subjects, his firm intention to punish the guilty, and his purpose to use his fullest power to maintain peace, justice, and tranquillity throughout his dominions and among all races and religionists. The magnitude and difficulty of the task of the new régime should win the sympathy of all well-wishers of peace and justify a fair opportunity of accomplishment without interference.

The hopeful promise of reforms seems to be confirmed by the recent official reports from Turkey that the constitutional government is taking vigorous measures for the complete restoration of order in Asia Minor, for a rigid investigation of the massacres, and for the effective military protection of the disturbed districts. All of which, it is hoped, will prevent a recurrence of the recent lamentable events, which are deplored as keenly by the President as they can be by any citizens.

A copy of the petition of the Armenian Evangelical Alliance will be communicated to the American ambassador to Turkey, who is fully aware of the President's views in the premises.

I have, etc.,

HUNTINGTON WILSON.

Publicity has been recently given to the trial and execution of one or more individuals as an evidence of the good faith of the new Sultan, Mohammed VI, who expresses disapprobation of all the acts of his predecessor and of the Pasha generals who had control of affairs during the war. It is barely possible that these executions have actually taken place, but in any event the widest publicity is being given to them in the conviction which the Turk has long entertained that the Occidental mind will interpret an act of this sort as being done for the reasons and pursuant to the motives that would dominate an Occidental government in such an inquiry and punishment. Nothing of the kind is true of the Turkish attitude. They are merely laying their offenses upon scapegoats and dismissing them into the wilderness. If necessary a hundred or a thousand victims would be offered for the purpose of clearing the skirts and saving the suzerainty of the Sultan. The American mind, without the actual experience of living under the Turkish government and with the subjects of Turkey, cannot readily appreciate the attitude of the Mohammedan Turk to his non-Moslem subjects. Justice to the Christian populations of Turkey impartially administered is absolutely incompatible with

the Mohammedan religion or with the Ottoman Turk's theory of government, and the sooner that is realized the better. In Mohammedan law there is only one word expressing the relation of the Moslem to the non-Moslem, and that is *Jehad*, i.e., Holy War.

In a report on the capitulations of the Ottoman empire, published in 1881 by our state department,¹ Edward A. Van Dyck calls attention to the fact that of all consuls residing in the various Moslem countries along the shores of the Mediterranean those that are sent by the government of the United States are, perhaps, more deficient than any others in an acquaintance with the growth and history of the peculiar and exceptional relations that have long existed between the Christian nations of Europe and the Mohammedan nations of North Africa and Western Asia. The writer observes:

It accordingly happens quite often that a newly appointed consul arrives at his post in a Turkish city without a knowledge of the principles that govern the relations of his fellow-citizens residing in the consular district to which he has been sent with the authorities and natives of the land, between whom he is the only proper medium of official communication. . . . He knows not the native language and he has scarcely any, or in most cases, no acquaintance at all with the commercial and diplomatic languages of the Levant, which are the French and Italian.

With one or two notable exceptions, this same criticism might apply to the ministers of the United States at Constantinople. They have been almost uniformly ignorant of the fundamental characteristics of Turkish character and of Oriental customs and habits of thought and expression. Themselves direct and truth-speaking, they have been easily overreached by exaggerated courtesy and hyperbole of speech.

The Arabs have a tradition that when the devil set forth to distribute lies over the earth, he lay down with his seven bagfuls on a mountain to take a nap. An inquisitive Syrian got six bags opened, and liberated their contents, before Shaftan awoke. Hence the superfluity of falsehood in the Near East.

Kent in his *Law of Nations* observes that, "international

¹ Largely based on the English translation of the introduction to Dr. Ratteschi's *Manual on Ottoman Public and Private Law*, and on DeTesta's *Collection of Treaties with Turkey*, on Brunswick's work on the *Reforms and Capitulations of Turkey*, and on Arabic and other sources.

law, as professed by the civilized nations of Christendom, is the offspring of the communion of ideas subsisting between them, and is based upon a common origin, and an almost identical faith." In the light of this statement, Van Dyck states that the intercourse between the Christian world and the Mohammedan world is not founded upon the principles of the law of nations and that the relations of the one to the other for years had to be regulated solely with a view to political expediency and in accordance with treaties entered into between them. Anyone familiar with the Mohammedan religion and with the science of Moslem jurisprudence knows that there is, as above noted, only one relationship between those who recognize the apostleship of Mohammed and those who do not, i.e., *Jehad*. Someone has recorded of Brian Boru, the first king of Ireland, that he was a mythical character who never existed, and was succeeded by his son. It may be similarly stated that the fictitious will or command of Mohammed called in some ancient records, "The Treaty of Mohammed with the Christians," and often referred to as proof of Mohammedan justness and equity, is equally mythical. It never existed, and the successors of Mohammed have entertained the same sentiments as Mohammed did with regard to non-Moslems. The purpose of Islam is the propagation of faith in one God and in Mohammed as his prophet. And the mode of such propagation is by a holy, perpetual war against unbelievers, in order to convert them, or subject them to the payment of tribute. This right to wage war is the only principle of international law taught by Mohammedan jurists. Moreover, the "justice of the Cadi," and the equity of the Caliphs is evidence of the Arab nature and characteristics, not of those of the Ottoman Turks.

Singularly enough, the early European jurists took an identical position, recognizing no international law as against Moslems and holding that there ought always to be war with them. But about the middle of the nineteenth century the Sublime Porte under the stress of international events, recognized and itself exercised the right of legation and entered into many international obligations, capitulations or treaties. Since the Treaty of Paris in 1856, it has had a place in the political concert of Europe. This is not to say that there were not capitulations or treaties between Moslem rulers before the Turks, and between the Turks themselves, relat-

ing to certain commercial rights and the rights of citizens of various powers within the domains of the Sultan of Egypt or of Turkey. But it is a sufficient introduction to the statement that the United States of America, even since the Treaty of 1862 with Turkey, which was abrogated in 1882, has held an attitude of aloofness, with regard to affairs in Turkey and the treatment by Turkey of its non-Moslem subjects. An attitude, which, however consistent with the Monroe Doctrine, is at times inconsistent with those high principles which the government of the United States has from time to time asserted by force of arms; notably in the case of the Spanish War and the Philippines. Once in awhile the cruelty of the Turks, always ready to manifest itself, has found an opportunity. Such opportunities have arisen when the great military powers, of which alone it was afraid, were so engaged, that, before anything could be done by way of prevention, the Turks have by massacre attempted to cut the Gordian knot of their total inability to administer justice for and among their non-Moslem subjects.

I append extracts from the constitution of the Ottoman empire as revised in 1909 after the revolution of July, 1908, which constitution gave to our state department, as well as to the subjects of the Turkish empire, great hopes of a real reform. Note the following articles in particular:

4. That the Sultan is, in his character of Supreme Caliph, the protector of the Mohammedan religion.
5. His Imperial Majesty, the Sultan, is irresponsible; his person is sacred.
10. The liberty of the individual is absolutely inviolable. No one can under any pretext be arrested or made to suffer any penalty except according to the forms and in the cases prescribed by the religious and civil laws!
11. Islamism is the religion of the state.
26. Torture and examination by torture in all forms are entirely and absolutely forbidden!

And then note, after the provisions protecting civil rights, establishing judicial machinery, etc., Article 113:

In case of a state of affairs or indications of such a nature as to render disturbances probable at some point in the territory of the empire, the imperial government has the right to proclaim a state of siege.

The effect of a state of siege is the temporary suspension of the civil laws.

So that we may say that all that has been done by Turkish soldiery acting under military orders in respect to the subject

Christian peoples of Turkey since the war began has been done under the constitution.

AMERICA'S RELATION TO TURKEY DURING THE WAR

But before discussing the direct subject of this paper, it is proper to inquire whether the United States is under any particular obligation, moral or otherwise, to take an active part internationally in enforcing a settlement of this Turkish question. I contend that it is; and this by reason of the following facts:

When Turkey entered the Great War as an ally of Germany she declared war on France and England. Thereupon the United States government, through its consular and diplomatic agents, was intrusted with the protection of the interests of the French and English nationals in Turkey. With few if any exceptions these nationals in Syria were missionaries, or missionary teachers, representing English and French missionary activities which had been established for several generations in Syria. Many of these missionaries were aged men and women, gentlefolk, refined, loved by the people. *Suffice it to say that they were non-combatants* and entitled to reasonable opportunity to leave the country. They were promptly arrested by the Turkish governor of the province, who was a member of the Turkish war cabinet and a general in the Turkish army. These people appealed at once to the American consul, who sent back word by the messenger (who was, of course, one of the governor's soldiery) that he "could do nothing." One of the English missionaries sent back a protest saying that if the situation were reversed and an American in like case appealed to the English consul, "the English consul would secure his release in fifteen minutes." To this the American consul sent back the reply that his "instructions were explicit, *not to embroil the United States.*"

It seems inconceivable that our state department could have intended to "welch" on its international obligation of trust to protect the rights of these nationals by any general or explicit instructions. Nevertheless, as the matter developed, the United States was not embroiled! These French and English missionaries were interned in dirty dungeons, their rights ignored, and that stage of the incident was closed.

But, the Turkish government was in possession of the informa-

tion that the instructions of the American consuls were that they must not embroil the United States. Whereupon step number two was taken. When the American consul had assumed the responsibility of protecting French and English interests he had proceeded to the French and English consulates and sealed the archives and the offices with the United States seal. The Turkish governor-general repaired to the French consulate, broke the United States seal and claimed to have discovered, as was afterwards recorded in his proclamation, published in the Cairo newspapers, documents implicating the loyalty of members of the Syrian reform committee, who had for years been endeavoring to secure reforms in taxation and the administration of justice in the province of Syria. On the strength of these alleged proofs of disloyalty he arrested and executed a number of the members of this committee. One member of the committee who was not arrested and escaped has told me these facts in my own office.

I have been unable by careful inquiry to ascertain that the United States ever secured any satisfaction for this outrageous insult to its dignity, although I gave the fact the utmost publicity at the time that I learned of it. My information is that nothing was done by the United States at the time. The incident in its second stage was thus closed.

This brings us to the early part of 1915. The United States, in 1909, had, as above stated, expressed itself as precluded from any consideration of a question of intervention, in the matter of the atrocities perpetrated in Asia Minor, because it was not a signatory of the treaty of Berlin. This was a public document and, of course, thoroughly well known to the Sublime Porte. France and England were the only powers fear of whom would have deterred the Turks from what they were about to do. Germany was its ally, and, if we are to believe the testimony even of Germans, was in part an instigator of the events that followed. But, for the purposes of this paper, I wish to emphasize the fact that it was not until after the United States had been felt out, and it had been discovered that the representatives of the United States had explicit instructions "not to embroil the United States," and after the United States had made no sign, *although the United States seal had been placed* by its consul upon the French consulate, and had been violated by the Turkish governor-general, and noth-

ing had been done, that the massacres commenced in the spring of 1915. They did commence. They were continued. News of them leaked out, and in the long cruel years since that time persons in the United States have been contributing to the relief of the victims of Turkish savagery, trying to keep body and soul together of the wretched survivors of the families raped, robbed, deported and massacred by the brutal Turkish soldiery under direct orders from Constantinople. Yet the United States, so far as its official activities have been concerned, did not declare war on Turkey! We finally declared war upon Turkey's ally, Germany, but we limited our diplomatic representations as to these massacres to a request through Germany that Berlin would exercise its kindly and humane offices to persuade the Sultan to put an end to these atrocities. A request that must have aroused that sense of humor which the Oriental possesses in such marked degree. Talaat and Enver have been known to smile.* Keen and intuitive as is the Oriental mind, it was difficult for the Turk to understand how he could be an ally of Germany and we could be at war with Germany and yet not at war with him. The argument *post hoc propterea hoc* may not apply, but it suggests itself. The United States when it entered the war did so with assurances to the world that gave to our entry into the war the character of a crusade in support of freedom, liberation of oppressed peoples and the determination to crush those powers of savagery that seemed to threaten the world. But so far as Turkey was concerned we refused to strike a blow to free her cruelly oppressed subjects—nor was our flag seen in the operations that laid those people under eternal obligations to their liberators.

These facts, however, I believe lay us under the compulsion of a moral obligation at the present juncture.

AMERICA'S POST-WAR RELATION TO TURKEY

But now that the war is over and the covenants of the League of Nations are being welded the situation has changed.

Consider first the attitude of the several nations interested in the solution of the problem before us. The attitude of isola-

*NOTE: Our state department even sent a cable message felicitating the Sultan on his august birthday! Even the melancholy monarch must then have smiled.

tion of the United States may be assumed to have been changed forever.

In the 12th of Mr. Wilson's fourteen points uttered January 8, 1918, he demanded:

The Turkish portions of the present Ottoman empire should be assured a secure sovereignty but the other nationalities which are now under Turkish rule should be assured an undoubted security of *life* and *an absolutely unmolested opportunity of autonomous development*.

In his rejoinder, of February 11, 1918, to the Central Powers, i.e., formulating his "four principles," he denied the right to barter provinces from sovereignty to sovereignty, and demanded that every territorial settlement must be made "in the interest and for the benefit of the populations concerned," but added as the fourth principle that, "all well-defined national aspirations shall be accorded the utmost satisfaction that can be accorded them *without introducing new or perpetuating old elements of discord and antagonism*."

In his Mount Vernon address July 4, 1918, he propounded as one of the "four ends" being fought for and which must be conceded before there could be peace:

The settlement of every question whether of territory, of sovereignty, of economic arrangement or of political relationship, *upon the basis of the free acceptance of that settlement by the people immediately concerned*.

There can be no argument on the proposition that Armenia and Syria can claim rightfully that as nationalities under Turkish rule, whose interests are vitally concerned by any territorial settlement of the Turkish situation, they must be protected by the fourteen points, the four principles and the four great ends.

As to the attitude of Russia in relation to Armenia, the memorandum presented by the delegates of the Armenian Republic to the Peace Conference on February 26, 1919, pointed out that after the breakdown of the Russian-Caucasian army and the withdrawal of their support of the Armenians, who had so loyally coöperated in the war up to that point, the Russians by the infamous treaty of Brest-Litovsk completely deserted their Armenian allies. This treaty left to the Turks the provinces of Turkish Armenia, which had been conquered by the Russian and Armenian armies, and also turned over to the Turks the purely Armenian provinces of the Caucasus, of Kars and Kaghisman, of Batum and Ardahan.

The Bolshevik government gave publicity to a so-called "Secret Treaty" that had been made by Great Britain, France and Russia, by which Turkish Armenia was to be partitioned between France and Russia. France was given Syria, and England was to receive Mesopotamia and the Palestinian ports of Acre and Haifa. Whether the President of the United States had knowledge of this treaty when he made his pledges to the oppressed nationalities in Turkey at the time we entered the great crusade now proves to be immaterial. I do not believe he had such knowledge. The Arabs, who revolted, and were achieving their plan of a free Arabia and Syria, certainly did not—Prince Faisul so states. But, as I say, it is now immaterial, for, in documents—presented by the Rev. Dr. Bliss, the president of the Protestant College of Beirut, when he was invited to appear before the Peace Conference on behalf of the people of Syria, who petitioned to be consulted as to their political future before any government were imposed upon them by the Peace Conference—it appears that in 1918 a declaration had been agreed to between the British and French governments and communicated to the President of the United States of America. This was published in the *Palestine News* of November, 1918, and the following is an extract therefrom:

The aim which France and Great Britain have in view in waging in the East the war let loose on the world by German ambition, is to ensure the complete and final emancipation of all those peoples so long oppressed by the Turks, and to establish national governments and administrations which shall derive their authority from the initiative and free will of the people themselves.

To realize this, France and Great Britain are in agreement to encourage and assist the establishment of native governments in Syria and Mesopotamia, now liberated by the Allies, as also in those territories for whose liberation they are striving and to recognize those governments immediately they are effectively established.

Far from wishing to impose on the peoples of these regions this or that institution, they have no other care than to ensure, by their support and practical aid, the normal workings of such governments and administrations as the peoples shall themselves have adopted; to guarantee impartial and even justice for all, to facilitate the economic development of the country by arousing and encouraging local initiative, to foster the spread of education, to put an end to those factions too long exploited by Turkish policy—such is the part which the two allied governments have set themselves to play in liberated territories.

In addition to this I quote the nineteenth section of the League of Nations Covenant, as presented to the Peace Conference

February 14, 1919, so far as I am able to quote it in its last-known form:

Certain communities formerly belonging to the Turkish empire have reached a stage of development where their existence as independent nations can be provisionally recognized, subject to the rendering of administrative advice and assistance by a mandatory power until such time as they are able to stand alone. The wishes of these communities must be a principal consideration in the selection of the mandatory power.

I learn that a commission has accordingly been despatched from the Peace Conference to elicit such wishes on the ground.

THE FOUR NATIONALITIES

We have mentioned four groups or distinct nationalities to be protected in any international arrangement for the future of the Ottoman empire. If the claims of these four groups are recognized to any substantial extent the direct result will be to restrict the Sultan of Turkey to the territorial boundaries of the so-called province of Anatolia; to internationalize Constantinople, the Dardanelles, and the Bagdad railway; and to leave the Sultan shorn of his suzerainty of the Greeks of Asia Minor to the west, the Armenian republic to the east, the province of Syria to the south, and to the south of that the kingdom of Arabia.

THE ARAB CLAIMS

Each of the groups above mentioned makes its peculiar claim to recognition. The Arabs revolting against the Turks, have occupied the entire Arabian peninsula, have organized a government under the King of Hedjaz, have seized the holy cities of Mecca and Medina, and rendered substantial service to the Allies by furnishing troops that were used by General Allenby in his expeditionary force for the occupation of Palestine and Syria. The recognition of their rights presents an interesting feature with regard to the future of Mohammedanism. The original Caliphs were Arabs. The language of Islam is the Arabic. Mecca and Medina are Arab cities and holy cities of the religion. With the conquests of the Ottoman Turk the Osmanli assumed rights of leadership and control in the Moslem world against which there has always been strong protest. The Sheikh-ul-Islam has been located at the capital of the Ottoman empire and has interchangeably been

dominated by or has dominated the politics of the empire. To de-nationalize Constantinople might conceivably result in the Sheikh-ul-Islam repairing to the Holy City of Mecca and in restoring the purity of the original Islamic rule. Or the King of Hedjaz, who was himself Shereef of Mecca, or even his picturesque son, Prince Faisul, under the influence of the romantic ideals of Lawrence, his Fidus Achates, might assume the Caliphate.

The Arab hatred and distrust of the Turkish claims could not have been lessened by the brutal threat of the Turkish garrison of Medina, when they were attacked, to blow up Mohammed's Tomb! The Arab Moslems may again come into their own. They would include the wandering pastoral Bedawins who are simple monotheists and, though regarded by the government as Mohammedans, have no religious sheikhs or imams, no places of worship, no hours of prayer, rarely keep the Fast of Ramadan, or make the pilgrimage to Mecca. So the Moslems say: "There are three classes who have no religion, muleteers, Bedawin Arabs, and women."—(*Kamil*, H. H. Jessup.)

The character of the pure Arab, on the other hand, has been unchanged through the centuries. His dignity, his cult of hospitality, his pride of race, his ambition, his independence, his virility, all give promise of the emergence of a nation apt for self-government and capable of centralizing within itself the hopes and aspirations of the Moslem world with all that that implies.

CONFICTING CLAIMS OF SYRIA

The adjustment of the boundary between the kingdom of the Arabs and the province of Syria, supposing the latter to extend from the angle formed by the Asia Minor coast with the easterly coast of the Mediterranean, from Antioch and Aleppo down to the Egyptian frontier, would be a matter not unattended with difficulties. Damascus is, in a sense, one of the Holy Cities of Islam, but it is also the historic capital of Syria. Yet Prince Faisul desires to have his boundaries extend to include the region around Damascus. On the other hand, the province of Syria, if it is to be self-supporting, must control the hinterland including Aleppo and Damascus. It should include the whole coast from Alexandretta down to Egypt, and should go right back to the desert and include the Damascus plains. The plains of the Bukaa or Coele-

Syria, between the Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon ranges are the most fertile part of Syria. Nothing would be gained by continuing the separation of Lebanon from the coast cities.² As a matter of

NOTE.—The following letter expands this suggestion of incompatibility:

² To the Editor of The New York Times:

Thus far the objections raised against the claim of the King Hedjaz to rule Syria and Mesopotamia have been that the Syrians and Mesopotamians are not of Arab race; that historically they possessed, and still possess, a much higher stage of civilization, and that socially and intellectually they are way ahead. The logical inference is, therefore, that they cannot hope to reap many economic and educational benefits if their countries join Arabia.

But there is another and more cogent reason why such a political union is inadvisable, and that is religion. Religion, we should bear in mind, is the controlling factor in the affairs of that part of the Near East of which I am writing. When, a few years ago, D. Saaty of Providence, R. I., took to Mosul an ice-making machine, he was told by the authorities there that the ice making was the work of the Creator and that, therefore, it was against the will of Allah to grant him a permit. The difference between the inhabitants of the Tigris-Euphrates Valley and those of the Arabian peninsula, as far as enlightenment goes, is like that which exists between the Americans and the Mexicans.

What the various parts of Turkey need, and need very badly, is the establishment of a just and tolerant government. But no native race at present can administer such a government, whether Arabs, Syrians, Assyrians, Armenians, Turks, or Kurds. For they all lack the sense of political justice and the spirit of religious tolerance as are embodied in the principles of our western institutions. How could they be otherwise when they have been for many centuries living in the environments created by the crooked and oppressive Turk? There is no feeling of race unity among them; religion is their sole guiding principle. But the conflicting beliefs have kept them apart and tend to prevent their union as a single nation. The most deplorable fact is that there are no native influences to counteract these divergent tendencies. Hence comes the urgent need for foreign mandatories.

We may admit, I think, that the Arabs are as just in their dealings as any nationality of their neighbors. But it must be conceded also that the people of Al-Hedjaz are the most intolerant. This is attested by the undeniable fact that no person not belonging to their creed can enter Makkah, where the King of Arabia resides, and come out alive if he is caught. Now, how the Makkans will be able to make good in Syria and Mesopotamia, where live so many Christians, Jews, Druses, Devil Worshippers, and what not, is very hard to understand. It is still harder to comprehend how enlightened European statesmen, who were a while ago making so much noise about the rights of small nationalities, allow themselves to be persuaded that narrow-minded nomads can advantageously govern civilized communities.

The natives of Mesopotamia desire the establishment of an independent state along modern lines, under the trusteeship of Great Britain, to be administered

fact, taking the population of the cities on the coast, and of Damascus together with the population of the Lebanon villages, the Druse, the Maronites,³ the Nusairiyeh, diverse as they are, hostile to one another as they are, yet, there are influences that would set the province on its feet in less than twenty years. These are the influences that have been at work through Christian missions for three generations, the tutelage of a disinterested, impartial mandatory, the intelligence of the people, and the long-developing desire for independence together with a just system of taxation and an opportunity to develop the resources of the country and a wise system of re-forestation. One of the interesting landmarks on the Eastern slope of the Lebanon is a stone with the inscription:

DELIM	i. e. Hadrian's Forest Preserve.
SYLV	
HADR	
IMP.	
<hr/>	

Under the Turks there has been no "forest preserve" and even the Cedars of Lebanon have been decimated. The commissioners who have been sent by the Peace Conference to Syria to ascertain

for all of its inhabitants without distinction as to race or creed. I say Great Britain because of the peculiar interest of England in that part of the Orient, and because of her immense sacrifices in bringing deliverance to all Mesopotamia, including the province of Diarbekir, which lately has been occupied by British troops, but above all because we have a great confidence in the British sense of justice and in the British virtue of religious tolerance which she has so brilliantly demonstrated in India and Egypt. For this reason we are respectfully petitioning the Peace Conference not to entangle our fair land of the Two Rivers with the dreary land of the desert.

ISYA JOSEPH.

Port Chester, N. Y., Feb. 10, 1919.

³ Maronites: "A papal sect, the ancient Monothelites, who accepted the papacy 1182 A.D., during the Crusades. They get their name from John Maron, monk, priest and patriarch, who died 707 A. D. They adhere to the Oriental rite, conducting service in the Syriac, a language not understood by the people. The only sin unpardonable by the priests is reading the Bible. The people are chiefly peasants, in Northern Lebanon, an illiterate people, and an educated priesthood, sworn to allegiance to Rome and yet having a married parish clergy. Their head is the Patriarch of Antioch, living in Lebanon, and regarded by the people as hardly inferior to the Pope."—(*Fifty-three Years in Syria*, H. H. Jessup.)

the desire of the people by some form of referendum with regard to the power which they would ask to have exercise the mandate of the League of Nations, will ascertain the ratio now subsisting between the Moslems and the so-called Christians of this province. In the Lebanon the Christians are in a majority, unless the systematic starvation practiced by the Turks has decimated them. This includes the Maronites, Greek Catholics and Protestants, but in the cities other than Damascus the Moslems probably would be in the majority. I do not here take into account the Druzes⁴ of the Lebanon nor the Nusairiyeh⁵ in the mountains

⁴ Druzes: The Druzes are neither Moslem nor Christian, but a peculiar, secret, mystic sect, having no priesthood and no assemblies for worship, claiming to be Unitarians, or believers in one God, infinite, indefinable, incomprehensible and passionless, who has become incarnate in a succession of ten men, the last of whom was the mad Egyptian caliph, Hakim b'amr Illah, who was assassinated A.D. 1044. They are more of a political than a religious society, and the national spirit is intense. The Druse nation can neither increase nor decrease. It is lawful to pretend to believe in the religion of any sect among whom they dwell. Among the Moslems they are Moslems, among the Jews, Jews, among the Greeks they are Greeks, among the Romanists they are good papists, and among the Protestants they are Evangelical Biblical Christians. In politics they look to the English for protection, and have always favored the American schools. They are courteous, hospitable, industrious, temperate and brave. The okkal, or initiated class, use neither tobacco nor liquors of any kind. Any one leaving their sect for Christianity would be disinherited."—(*Fifty-three Years in Syria*, H. H. Jessup.)

In the year 1872 they suffered a serious disappointment. It was the year predicted as the final crisis or cataclysm of their religion. Their prophet El-hakem, who claimed to be an incarnation of the Deity, promised when he died, 1021 A. D., to return with an immense army from China, overthrow Islam and subject the earth to his sway.

⁵ Nusairiyeh: They hold to the transmigration of souls, that the souls of all men at death pass into new bodies, and that unbelievers are at death transformed into some one of the lower animals. They believe that the spirits of Moslem sheikhs at death take the bodily form of asses; that Christian doctors enter swine bodies; that Jewish rabbis take the form of male apes; that wicked Nusairis enter into domestic animals; great sceptics among them into apes, while persons of mixed character enter bodies of men of other sects. They simulate all sects, as do the Druzes, and on meeting Moslems swear to them that they likewise fast and pray. But on entering a mosque they mutter curses against Abu Bekr, Omar and Othman and others. They say, "We are the body, all other sects are clothing; but whatever clothing a man may put on, it does not injure him, and one who does not simulate is a fool, for no reasonable man will go naked in the market-place." So they are Christians with the Christians, Jews with the Jews, and all things, literally, to all men.

north of Tripoli. It has been reported that during the war by the systematic starvation of village after village in the Lebanon the number of the Christian population has been diminished, some estimates reaching as high as 100,000. Whether this be true or not there would be no expectation of a constitutional government in which the Christians of Syria could have the majority.

It will be noted that this discussion of the province of Syria makes no account of the so-called Zionist state, to include Jerusalem and perhaps the province of Judea. To the writer this plan presents no features entitling it to consideration. Politically it is an iridescent dream. That there should be, under a constitutional government to be erected under the tutelage of a mandatory of the League of Nations, absolute freedom of immigration to the Jews is unquestionable, but the movement, judging from the past, is not a national movement on the part of the Jews. Many of their leaders are lukewarm in their advocacy; many of them are frankly opposed to it, and, so far as a Jewish population in Syria is concerned, it might be said as a broad generalization, that the Yahudi or Jew as a member of the community is anathema alike to the Arab and to the Turk. Under international protection and as a place of refuge for the pauper Jews of Russia and southeastern Europe, the scheme of Baron Hirsch, philanthropic as it was, has not even yet resulted in creating an adequate nucleus for a national life. I am aware that this Zionist propaganda has ardent supporters in Eng-

They have secret signs, questions and answers by which they recognize each other. For example, one says on meeting a stranger, "Four, two fours, three and two, and as many more twice over in thy religion, what place have they?" Answer: "In the Journeying Chapter," etc. They use signs, and they use the interlacing triangle. In their secret worship they partake of bread and wine. They have borrowed from the Bible, the Koran, and from Persian and Sabian mysticism. They teach that out of man's sins God created Satans and devils, and out of the sins of those devils He made women, and hence no woman is taught their religion. When the initiated meet for prayer to Ali, guards are placed to keep the women at a distance. Their most binding oath is to swear by the faith of the covenant of Ali, prince of believers, and by the covenant of "Ain Mim Sin." Soleman bribed one of the chiefs of the "Northerner" Sect of Nusairis to tell him the "hidden mystery," which proved to be that the heavens are the impersonation of Ali Ibn Abu Talib; the wine-colored river in heaven is Mohammed; and the milk-white river is Salman al Farsi; that when we are purified from earthly grossness, our spirits will be elevated to become stars in the Milky Way, etc.

land and in this country, but, so far as I have any opinion in the premises, it is adverse to the erection of a separate state interrupting the continuity of the province of Syria to the Egyptian frontier, and is not based upon any of the fundamental ideas of opportunity for autonomous development to a race or nationality outlined above. It does not represent a national purpose so much as a racial sentiment. The Jews in the United States as a class covet the name of Americans and deprecate hyphenation. But in any event, should there be recognized such a community or state, it should not be allowed to extend its boundaries beyond the old province of Judea, except perhaps that it might have access to the sea, say at Jaffa.

ARMENIA

The situation of Armenia seems to have been more perfectly crystallized than that of any other one of these groups. The so-called "Secret Treaty" made in 1915–1916 during the war, between France and England, relating to the responsibilities of each in respect to Syria, Armenia, Mesopotamia, and other parts of the Ottoman empire, was in the nature of counting chickens before they were hatched. In another connection I have asked whether President Wilson, when he enunciated his fourteen points and four principles and four great ends, was or was not in ignorance of the provisions of this treaty. If he had knowledge of them then he would not have uttered these great pledges to the provinces of the Ottoman empire without knowing he would have the approval and coöperation of France and England in fulfilling them. If he did not know of them, the provisions of this treaty may be deemed to be waived, by the joint declaration above quoted, no less than if the powers that made it enter into the peace treaty and the concomitant covenants of the League of Nations. For to whatever power that league shall issue its mandate in respect to Armenia, it could only be France, England or the United States, to which such mandate would issue. Their consent to the peace treaty and the covenant of the league would amount to the abdication of any special privilege or right which either may believe herself to have achieved by virtue of these stipulations plus their joint victory over the Turk. Armenia comes to the convention requesting recognition of her independence. She has history and

geography to aid in her claims to definite national boundaries. But her neighbors-to-be constitute the reason of her willingness to be under a temporary tutelage. The Turk will be on her western border. The province of Syria on the south will give her little concern. Persia on the east is and will be too weak to trouble the new nation unless incited or helped by the Great Bear on the north, whose claws of aggression may be assumed to be clipped if the Dardanelles be "opened as a free passage to the ships and commerce of all nations."

To what should this tutelage extend, and what is the Armenian purpose in desiring it? The answer is reasonably obvious. The new nation contemplates:

1. A constitution guaranteeing to all its inhabitants the institutions of free government, including a representative congress.
2. A judicial system under which the rights so guaranteed can be protected, and life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness be realized.
3. A fiscal system, internal and external (for it will have littorals on the Black Sea and on the Mediterranean) including the administration of a preliminary national loan, a just tax law and a plan for development of the great mineral and other natural resources without sacrificing their ultimate control by the people of Armenia when and as developed.
4. A military and police system adequate to the purpose of self-defense and self-control.

But such plans must not be rushed or hurried. For, assuming the recognition of the new Armenia by the powers forming the League of Nations and the posting of "No Trespassing" notices on the Turkish and Russian frontiers, time is indispensable in which expatriated Armenians may return, give in their allegiance, and participate in the deliberations and elections requisite to launch the new government.

As to the constitution and the system of judicial administration no doubt much preliminary work has been done.

As to the details of a fiscal or military system, outside aid or advice is imperative. A national loan to be expended wisely and without extravagance, would doubtless be subject to a condition as to supervision of its expenditure for a period within which the new nation could reasonably be expected to get on a firm footing of

development of its own resources. Without such a loan there would be the temptation to raise money by improvident exploitation of their rich mineral and other resources through concessions, as a result of which the bulk of these great assets might fall under foreign control.

GREECE IN ASIA MINOR

With the demands of the fourth group, the Greeks in Asia Minor, the following situation presents itself. From classic days they have been indigenous to the soil. Crossing the Aegean as colonists they settled in another jurisdiction and took the chances of such settlement. But at the same time they have created the agriculture and commerce of western Asia Minor. Numerically, they are in certain districts in an overwhelming majority, and, so far as oppression goes, they come within the purview of protection of the President's promise on entering the Great War. They figure their losses by the massacres as but little less than do the Armenians. To those of us who favor the constricting of the boundaries of any Turkish rule to the narrowest possible limits, the idea of extending the power and sovereignty of Greece over the western shores of Asia Minor, and for a considerable distance back into the hinterland, commends itself as in the interest of justice and of civilization. The limits of Greece are too narrow to contain her population. And it is true in a large sense that the government of Greece under its present Prime Minister would give promise of restoration of order and of the establishment of a just government in western Asia Minor. Moreover, the relation of the Greek Church to the civil and political life in Greece is such as to afford a guaranty of the continuance of such just government if the Grecian sovereignty were so extended. The Greeks are naturally maritime traders—the Turk is a naval joke.⁵

THE RESIDUARY LEGATEE

As to the future of the Ottoman Turk—shorn of his territory, disgraced in the judgment of the civilized world, confined between boundaries having a stronger Greece on the west and an industri-

⁵ NOTE: This prefiguration of the matter has been since justified by the landing of two divisions of the Greek Army at Smyrna, under protection of Allied warships.—ED.

ous and flourishing Armenian state on the east under the tutelage and guardianship of one of the great powers of the world—his fate calls for no sympathy. It is astonishing that from British sources there is a constant reëmergence of the sentimental appeal to preserve the integrity of the Ottoman empire! That such a sentiment should effectually sway the judgment of the great powers seems inconceivable.

THE BAGDAD RAILWAY

Leon Dominian in a review in *The Geographical Review* for January, 1919, of Morris Jastrow's book on *The War and the Bagdad Railway* points out that the whole history of Asiatic Turkey is a record of traffic and transportation. It is this fact that, so far as Egypt was concerned in its relation to the Babylonian dynasties in the past, and so far as the whole world is concerned today in questions affecting the Near and Far East, makes the question of control of the caravan trade avenues overland to the Far East always a question of intimate international concern. The caravan routes from Egypt up through Palestine to Hamath are now replaced with railroads connecting the new Bagdad railroad, making available, not only for the support of the new Armenia but for the world, its rich agricultural resources, its manufactures of silk and woolen rugs, and also its resources of iron, silver, coal, zinc, manganese and copper, practically combining all the previous problems of transportation in the problem: what is to be the future of the Bagdad railway? Except for outside foreign influence in localities and the existence of the so-called "caravan routes," there is no adequate system of roads in Armenia or Syria or Arabia. Dominian points out, as it had been previously developed by Ratzel,

That periods of prosperity in Asiatic Turkey corresponded to periods when roads were adequately policed and travel was safe. That there was such a condition existing from a time some six centuries before Christ and lasting through Byzantine times, but that the coming of the Turks brought desolation and stopped human circulation. Poverty grew as travel diminished.

It is obvious that the railroad as now projected and built (the exact facts not yet being fully known as to the continuity of the line through to Bagdad to meet the military lines built by the British during the war) was due to German money and influence

in Turkey. But the fruits of this great project are to be reaped primarily by the regions through which the railroad runs, and the regions which have railway communication connecting with it as a trunk line; and, secondarily, by international trade. This railroad would run when completed through the dominions of several powers, and therefore ought, as much as Constantinople and the Dardanelles, to be internationalized. Whatever the powers given to any mandatory under the League of Nations Covenant, assuming it to come into operation, one of such powers to be expressly stipulated in the decree appointing the mandatory, should be the governmental power of consenting to the internationalization of such an important commercial trade route.

CONCLUSION

To sum up:

1. Turkey should be shorn of her suzerainty over the four groups above enumerated.

2. The Armenian Republic should be recognized with the probably immediate result that much of the Turkish population within its new boundaries will remove itself to the Turkish districts of Anatolia, and the Armenians scattered through Anatolia and the remaining fragment of European Turkey may be expected to return in large numbers to their native land. The Greeks of the Black Sea littoral have always been on good terms with the Armenians, and there is no reason why they should not become willing subjects of the new Armenian state. In fact, the present Greek government has expressed its willingness to have the Greeks of Pontus attached to an independent Armenia.

In respect to both of these groups it is well to repeat what has been elsewhere asserted, that the mere fact that the United States might be a mandatory for the new Armenia would not mean that it would be the sole link between Armenia and the world. French influence or French capital might have free access to the new republic, and at the expiration of the period fixed in the mandate to the United States, the people would be free to relate themselves to any sphere of influence and to have accepted as their creditor any power whose business men are willing to make their investments in the new dominion. No mandatory in addition to accepting the responsibilities laid upon it of preserving order, of developing

a stable government, would for a moment reject the capital that might be offered, from whatever source, in the development of such resources and in assisting to put the new nation upon a sound self-supporting basis. The selection of the mandatary should depend largely on its disinterestedness and the implied guarantee that it will not endeavor to exploit the province for its own profit.

3. Whether the province of Syria could become a nation in as short a time as that of Armenia is doubtful, because of the diverse and heterogeneous elements to be dealt with and of the fact that Syria has been the stamping ground for contending races, religions and armies since the days of Rameses, Thotmes, Tiglath Pileser and Assur bani Pal. The rocks above the Dog River at Beirut still retain records of the achievements of these great warriors, and at one time had graven upon them a record by Napoleon, which was afterwards, it was reported, chiseled out by direction of the British! But under the influences of education the Syrians have developed a high degree of intelligence, alertness and ability and are fully capable, if internal jealousies and factions do not impede or prevent their national development, of becoming a self-sustaining nation.

I do not agree with the claims of Prince Faisul that the Arab kingdom should include Syria. Arabia is huge. Its interior table-land has vast possibilities if capital and industry are admitted to develop its resources. Syria is a separate entity, has distinctive resources and ought not to be relinquished to the intolerance of purely Moslem rule. I confess I do agree with Faisul's objection to a French protectorate. He points to northern Africa and says that while French colonial government is benign and orderly it does not develop the people governed into good Arabs but into "first-class sham Frenchmen." The Oriental mind is keen and in this instance his analysis is profound. Mr. Lewis S. Gannett thinks Prince Faisul as the leader of the Arab army should be selected as the ruler of Syria. I believe such a selection would be unwise as tending to the ultimate aggrandizement of the kingdom of Arabia, and not in the real interests of separate Syrian autonomy.

4. As to the kingdom of Arabia—it is a question whether it would require to be under the tutelage of a mandatary of a league

of nations. They do not ask military protection. They have all the seacoast their commercial needs require. It would be interesting if, under international recognition they were protected from outside attack, and coming into the sisterhood of nations, were required to abandon their exclusion of outside influences, and were subjected to the civilizing processes of Christian education. They might renew then their title to international respect and achieve a position of dignity and power among the nations of the world.